



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

tance appear to modify his text construction, or, we may hope, to supplement it by the long-lost original Greek. Dr. Beeson's reference to Evetts' edition of the *History of the Patriarchs of Alexandria* (p. xiv) as though it had not appeared, is curious, since Evetts' first part, the part dealing with Marcellus, Manes, and Archelaus, was published in the spring of 1904.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Vorgriechische Ortsnamen als Quelle für die Vorgeschichte Griechenlands. Von AUG. FICK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1905. 8vo. Pp. 173. M. 5.

When in 1853 F. A. Pott in his *Personennamen*, p. 451, called attention to the fact that Greek names of localities in *-avθ-*, *-ivθ-*, *-vθ-* (e. g. *Κόρινθος*, *Τίρυνς*), find a parallel in Minor Asiatic names ending in *-vδ-* (e. g., *Ἰωνδος*, *Καρόανδα*), his observation called forth neither approval nor contradiction. It is safe to say that Pott's contemporaries—and perhaps Pott himself—failed to realize the bearing of his suggestion. Matters, however, changed when in 1886 those two remarkable inscriptions, written in an Early Greek alphabet but in a “barbaric” language, were discovered on the island of Lemnos. The existence here in historical times of an ancient pre-Hellenic population within Greek territory became obvious even to the most skeptical minds, and the importance of this discovery for the history of the Greek language and for Greek ethnology can, without exaggeration, be compared with that of the Mycenaean finds for Greek archaeology. The first one to attempt to draw the linguistic and ethnological consequences of the Lemnian inscriptions was C. Pauli in his monograph *Eine vorgriechische Inschrift auf Lemnos* (Hannover, 1886).¹ On a wider scale and with special reference to Asia Minor the investigation was resumed by O. Kretschmer, who in his *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* (Göttingen, 1896), pp. 289, 492 f. furnished ample proof for the close connection of many of the most familiar Greek local names with similar ones found in Lycia, Cilicia, Cappadocia and various other regions of Asia Minor.

Fick's *Vorgriechische Ortsnamen* again marks a considerable step in advance. The question is for Fick no longer whether foreign elements have entered into the vocabulary of Greek local names. He has attempted to distinguish in detail between genuine Greek and originally foreign

¹ A valuable contribution toward discussing Pauli's views on the origin of the Etruscans is the recent programm by Professor A. Kannengiesser, *Ist das Etruskische eine hettitische Sprache?* (I. Ueber das *vθ-* Suffix im Etruskischen u. im Griechischen), Gelsenkirchen, 1908. The author arrives at the result that the Etruscan language shares the *vθ-* suffix as found with the Hittites and with the pre-Hellenic settlers of Greece.

names by collecting—within the boundaries of Greece proper and of the Greek islands—the whole mass of pre-Hellenic geographical names. He has, moreover, undertaken to ascertain systematically the ethnographical character of these names by endeavoring to assign every one of them to a definite language or at least to a definite race or tribe, such as Hittite, Kydonian, Pelasgian, Lelegian, etc.

Let it be said at once that we are moving on difficult ground. Proper and local names—as is well known—constitute one of the most difficult elements in every language. Names such as English *Essex*, *Sussex*, *London*, or German *Uelzen* (i. e., “Ulrichshausen,” OLG. *Ödalrikes-hūson*), *Arolsen* (formerly *Aroldessen*, i. e., “Aarwaldesheim” or “Aarwaldeshausen”) would probably defy the efforts of the etymologist if they were known to us only in their present obscured form. The difficulties of course are much greater in the case of names inherited from an extinct race or tribe of whose language we have hardly any other traces but these very names. In such cases the etymological analysis becomes largely a matter of conjecture, and the investigator must count not only on the reader’s intelligence, but also—to a certain extent—on his willingness to be convinced. This being so we cannot, in my opinion, but congratulate ourselves that Fick has deemed it worth his while to concern himself with the problem of pre-Hellenic Greek names. We could have in these matters no better guide than the scholar who was the first to teach us to understand the system of Greek proper names¹ and whose long-continued occupation with Greek local names²—combined with his often proved ingenuity in etymological and philological researches—has enabled him particularly for this line of work. The fact, however, should not be overlooked that words like “wohl” or “wohl nicht” or “wahrscheinlich” or “vielleicht” are used by Fick in this monograph over and over again, and that in not a few cases he has plainly to confess his inability to decide whether a certain name is of Greek or foreign origin.

There is probably room for a few more question marks. Fick (p. 25) is inclined to reckon, e. g., names like *Μασσαλία* (the modern *Marseille*) or *Μασσαλίας* (river in Crete) among the foreign names. These names, however, may be genuine Greek, with slightly obscured vocalism: *Μασσαλία* = *Μεσσαλία* (cf. *ὄβολος* = *ὄδελος*, and many similar instances), meaning a locality between two waters or two seas (*μεσσο-* = Att. *μεσο-*, cf.,

¹ *Die griechischen Personennamen nach ihrer Bildung erklärt*, Göttingen, 1874; second edition (by Fick and Bechtel), *ibid.*, 1894. While the second edition contains ampler material as regards the Greek names and is practically a new work, it is to be regretted that the editors deemed it necessary to omit entirely an interesting chapter of the original treatise, viz. the one on Indo-European proper names (pp. 66–219).

² See, e. g., Fick’s articles on “Griechische Ortsnamen” in Vol. XXI–XXVI of *Bezenb. Beiträge*. I am speaking besides from my personal acquaintance with the author, remembering, e. g., that when in 1880 I was to leave Göttingen and went to pay a parting visit to my beloved teacher, I found him working at the Greek local names.

e. g., ἐν δὲ μέσσωι Tab. Heracl.), like *Interlaken* or *Metapont*. Compare, for the first part of the compound, also the ancient Celtic name *Mediolanum* (= *Milano*). The name appears to have been given to towns (or rivers), situated between two inlets.

What has been said of the difficulties as to the separation of non-Hellenic from Hellenic names, applies equally to the second task which Fick has attempted to perform, viz., the definition of the ethnographical character of the non-Hellenic material. Fick has ventured, e. g., to distinguish on the island of Crete between Hellenic, Eteocretan, Kydonian, Pelasgian, and Phoenician names, although the languages of the Ἐτεόκρητες, Κύδωνες, and Πελασγοί are to us an unknown quantity, notwithstanding the fragment (cf. *Samml. d. griech. Dial.-Inscr.* III. 2, p. 363) of an ancient "Eteocretan" inscription from Praisos. Would it have been better then to refrain from any definite conclusions as to the ethnographical character of these names? I would answer this question decidedly in the negative. Fick's researches into the ethnographical relations of ancient Greece count among the most brilliant and important chapters of his book. Let us grant that many of his ingenious suggestions remain for the present conjectural: all due deductions having been made there remains enough that must be regarded as definitely proved. I would refer, e. g., to Fick's result, pp. 34 and 123 f., that very few Greek names (the Index, p. 167, gives 9 such names, three of them with a question mark) can with some certainty be claimed as Phoenician. As entirely convincing I would also regard Fick's attitude toward the much-ventilated question of the Pelasgians (see esp. pp. 97 and 143 f.). The Pelasgians with him have ceased to be a mere name or a kind of a specter. They have taken on flesh and blood and appear as one of the several pre-Hellenic tribes, with a language and a religion of their own, originally settled along the northern coast of the Aegean Sea, and from there spreading over the islands as far down as Crete and westward to Attica and other points of the continent.

In the case of the Pelasgians as well as in other instances Fick has successfully endeavored to trace the influence of the pre-Hellenic races on Greek mythology and religion. His remarks on these topics (e. g., on Ikaros and Hephaistos, pp. 55 and 139 f., on Hermes—"jedenfalls ursprünglich eine Gottheit der kleinen Leute, Bauern und Hirten, also der Urbewölkerung"—p. 131, on Aphrodite-Κίπρις p. 132, on the phallos cult p. 145, and so forth) contain valuable hints for students of Greek and of comparative mythology.

We believe with the author that for many problems connected with the ancient Greek local names, additional light may be expected from a more thorough understanding of the extinct languages of Asia Minor and especially from the decipherment of the Hittite inscriptions. After the recent finds near Boghasköj by Winckler of many additional Hittite

inscriptions written in cuneiform characters, we may hope that the time will finally come when we shall be able also to read the Hittite pictorial inscriptions.

HERMANN COLLITZ

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

Die ältesten Kalendarien aus Monte Cassino. Von E. A. LOEW, Dr. Phil., Carnegie Fellow of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome. Mit drei Tafeln. (Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters, begründet von LUDWIG TRAUBE. Dritter Band. Drittes Heft.) Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1908. M. 6.

Dr. Loew, a pupil of the great Munich paleographer, Traube, is preparing a work on Beneventan script, the script of southern Italy. In collecting his materials, he came across three MSS which exhibit this script in its earliest stage, one at Cava dei Tirreni (No. 23), the pretty little village that one visits from Naples, one at Paris (Lat. 7,530), one at Rome in the Biblioteca Casanatense (No. 641). He found that all three contained a Calendar of Saints' Days, along with tables for the computation of Easter; that all three were written at Monte Cassino; that the latest of the three (the Casanatensis, written in 811) was the original of which a Monte Cassino MS (No. 3), previously supposed to be the earliest specimen of Beneventan script, was a copy; and, seeing that the group offered a problem worth solution, he set himself to ascertain their exact relationship and history. His paleographical knowledge has enabled him to avoid the mistakes made by other writers regarding these MSS. Since the Easter-tables in the Paris MS (as in the Cavensis) began with the year 779, its composition had been wrongly referred to that year, e. g., by Steffens in the supplement to his *Lateinische Paläographie*, Plate 15. The Calendar in the Casanatensis has several entries by later hands. The difference in writing had not been noticed, and the MS had been post-dated in consequence. Dr. Loew has put these matters right and by a patient investigation which has left no detail neglected and no available clue unused, he has wrested their innermost secrets from these three MSS in a way that would have delighted his late teacher. The results he has won are of importance mainly for mediaeval church history, in particular for the ritual of Monte Cassino and the relations of that monastery with Benevento. But they bear on classical philology, too. The Cavensis is a MS of Isidore's *Etymologies*, exhibiting the better class of text. Thanks to Dr. Loew, we now know that it was written at Monte Cassino at some time between 779 and 798, and that the same is true of Paris 7,530. Now,